

Melissa Askew

From: Eric Hanson on behalf of ECFSHelp
Sent: Friday, April 20, 2007 11:14 AM
To: Melissa Askew
Subject: FW: Public Submission

*** Non-Public: For Internal Use Only *** -----Original Message-----
From: no-reply@erulemaking.net [mailto:no-reply@erulemaking.net]
Sent: Friday, April 20, 2007 10:03 AM
To: ECFSHelp
Subject: Public Submission

Please Do Not Reply This Email.

Public Comments on Implementation of Section 621(a)(1) of the Cable Communications Policy Act of 1984 as Amended by the Cable Television Consumer Protection and Competition Act of 1992;=====

Title: Implementation of Section 621(a)(1) of the Cable Communications Policy Act of 1984 as Amended by the Cable Television Consumer Protection and Competition Act of 1992 FR
 Document Number: E7-05118 Legacy Document ID:
 RIN:
 Publish Date: 03/21/2007 00:00:00
 Submitter Info:

First Name: Jennifer
 Last Name: McMahon
 Mailing Address: 28W701 Stafford Place
 City: Warrenville
 Country: United States
 State or Province: IL
 Postal Code: 60555
 Organization Name: City of Warrenville

Comment Info: =====

General Comment:

City of Warrenville submits these comments in response to the Further Notice of Proposal Rulemaking, released March 5, 2007, in the above-captioned rulemaking (?Further Notice?).

1. The City is the local franchising authority for Warrenville, Illinois. There is one franchised cable operator within our jurisdiction. That cable operator, along with the current expiration dates of their franchises are: Comcast of Illinois/Ohio/Oregon, LLC and August 16, 2011.

2. We support and adopt the comments of the National Association of Telecommunications Officers and Advisors, the National League of Cities, the National Association of Counties, the U.S. Conference of Mayors, the Alliance for Community Media, and the Alliance for Communications Democracy, filed in response to the Further Notice.

3. We oppose the Further Notice's tentative conclusion (at 140) that the findings made in the FCC's March 5, 2007, Order in this proceeding should apply to incumbent cable operators, whether at the time of renewal of those operators' current franchises, or thereafter. This proceeding is based on Section 621(a)(1) of the Communications Act, 47 U.S.C. ? 541(a)(1), and the rulings adopted in the Order are specifically, and entirely, directed at ?facilitat[ing] and expedit[ing] entry of new cable competitors into the market for the delivery of video programming, and accelerat[ing] broadband deployment? (Order at 1).

4. We disagree with the rulings in the Order, both on the grounds that the FCC lacks the legal authority to adopt them and on the grounds that those rulings are unnecessary to promote competition, violate the Cable Act's goal of ensuring that a cable system is ?responsive to the needs and interests of the local community,? 47 U.S.C. ?

521(2), and are in conflict with several other provisions of the Cable Act. But even assuming, for the sake of argument, that the rulings in the Order are valid, they cannot, and should not, be applied to incumbent cable operators. By its terms, the "unreasonable refusal" provisions of Section 621(a)(1) apply to "additional competitive franchise[s]," not to incumbent cable operators.

Those operators are by definition already in the market, and their future franchise terms and conditions are governed by the franchise renewal provisions of Section 626 (47 U.S.C. § 546), and not Section 621(a)(1).

5. We strongly endorse the Further Notice's tentative conclusion (at para. 142) that Section 632(d)(2) (47 U.S.C. § 552(d)(2)) bars the FCC from "preempt[ing] state or Local customer service laws that exceed the Commission's standards," and from "prevent[ing] LFs and cable operators from agreeing to more stringent [customer service] standards" than the FCC's.